United Nations A/55/1003–S/2001/644

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
2 July 2001

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session
Agenda item 64
Question of Cyprus

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Letter dated 28 June 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 25 June 2001, addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Aytuğ Plümer, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex would be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 64, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Umit **Pamir**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-43636 (E) 090701

Annex to the letter dated 28 June 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I would like to refer to the letter dated 29 May 2001 addressed to you by the Greek Cypriot representative at the United Nations (A/55/970-S/2001/541) concerning the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) by the Security Council.

It is clear from the tone of this letter that the Greek Cypriot side is not interested in a new partnership with the Turkish Cypriot side on the basis of political equality as a former partner in the 1960 Republic of Cyprus which was destroyed by the Greek Cypriot side in 1963. The purpose of the Greek Cypriot onslaught in 1963 was to convert the island into a Greek Cypriot republic and render the Turkish Cypriot co-founder partner a minority. The Greek Cypriot side has not succeeded in achieving this aim as the Turkish Cypriots valiantly defended their rights for 11 years from 1963 to 1974 and defied the illegal Greek Cypriot regime which tried to impose its will on them as the so-called "Government of Cyprus", after declaring the Constitution to be dead and buried. The Greek Cypriot side is still of the opinion that they can dictate their terms and their authority on the Turkish Cypriot people. One should never lose sight of the fact that the Greek Cypriot side, in pursuit of an unlawful aim, namely the union of the island with Greece, tried deliberately to destroy a guaranteed system of partnership resting on the political equality and effective participation of the two sides in the Government and on the mutually agreed principle that one community would not impose its will on the other. The *state of affairs* created by the 1960 Agreements was based on the internal balance between the two co-founder peoples in Cyprus and the external balance between Turkey and Greece over the island.

The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus was set up by the Turkish Cypriot people, 20 years after having been forced out of the state by force of arms. After the failure of all attempts to settle the Cyprus issue by establishing a new partnership on the basis of equality, the Turkish Cypriot people had no alternative but to declare their own independent state in order to prove to the Greek Cypriots, and those who supported them as the so-called legitimate "Government of Cyprus", that Turkish Cypriots have not and will not accept this *fait accompli* created by Greek Cypriot aggression.

The reference made by the Greek Cypriot representative in his letter to the TRNC as a "subordinate local administration in the occupied areas of Cyprus" is an insult to each one of us, an insult which we cannot ignore. The allegation that we are trying to exploit the issue of the renewal of the mandate of UNFICYP in order to gain some form of recognition or acknowledgement for what they call a "secessionist entity" is a further insult and an affront to our efforts to re-establish a new partnership on the basis of absolute equality between the two existing States in Cyprus.

The allegation by the Greek Cypriot representative that Turkey is pursuing a long-standing objective of legalizing its aggression against the "Republic of Cyprus" is a further insult to injury, knowing full well that it is the Greek Cypriot side which has taken up arms in order to destroy an internationally established partnership Republic for purposes which the 1960 Agreements prohibited. There was no

secession on the part of the Turkish Cypriot side but there was a bloody coup d'état by the Greek Cypriot side to take over a partnership state by ejecting the Turkish Cypriots from the state. As a consequence, the Turkish Cypriots exercised their right to establish their own legal administration in order to survive as a nation.

The Government of Turkey has been pursuing its efforts to help the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus to establish with the Greek Cypriot side a new partnership on the basis of a new agreement. Turkey's recognition of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is a valid proof of the intention of Turkey to continue to protect the Turkish Cypriot people as co-founder partner of the former 1960 Republic and as co-founder partner of any agreement that will be made in the future. Without this guarantee it is clear that there can be no new partnership with the former Greek Cypriot partner.

It is an irrefutable fact that UNFICYP cannot function in Cyprus without the consent of the parties involved in the conflict and Security Council resolutions clearly indicate that the parties in the conflict and the parties which will settle this conflict, without any interference from outside, are the Turkish Cypriot and the Greek Cypriot parties. The attempt to enforce UNFICYP's presence in the North under the pretext that the so-called Government of Cyprus (i.e. the Greek Cypriot party) has consented to its creation is unacceptable and will be resisted.

Furthermore, the fact that the composition and size of the force shall be established by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Governments of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is a clear indication that without the consent of the parties involved there can be no renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus. The Government of Cyprus in resolution 186 (1964) clearly refers to the bi-communal partnership government as envisaged by the 1960 Agreements.

The bi-communal partnership set-up has been destroyed by force of arms by the Greek Cypriot side. Currently, there exists an authority in the North which has all the attributes of a proper, democratically constituted State. Therefore it is necessary that until the dispute is settled between the two parties, the consent of both parties should be taken while extending the mandate of the Force.

In this context, it should be emphasized that the local military arrangements along the ceasefire line have been established with full participation of Turkish Cypriot authorities in those efforts. The Greek Cypriot representative has tried to conceal this fact. Even the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (Brahimi report) is purposely misrepresented. The Brahimi report explicitly states that peace operations have to be with the consent of the parties involved. This principle is underlined in paragraph 48 of the Brahimi report (A/55/305-S/2000/809): "The panel concurs that consent of the local parties, impartiality and use of force only in self-defence should remain the bedrock principles of peacekeeping".

The allegation by the Greek Cypriot side that the Cyprus issue is a question of foreign invasion and occupation of the territory of the Republic of Cyprus, by the Republic of Turkey, is not borne out by historical facts. I would like to emphasize that Turkey intervened in Cyprus, in accordance with her rights and obligations under the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee, following the Greek-Greek Cypriot coup d'état in July 1974, the aim of which was the annexation of the island by Greece. Turkish

intervention prevented not only the colonization of the island by Greece but also the annihilation of the Turkish Cypriot people at the hands of the Greek Cypriots and the invading Greek troops.

It is alleged that the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus depends entirely on the "occupying power" which finances its budget. The Greek Cypriot side, which ahs thrown out the Turkish Cypriots from the budget of Cyprus, now for 38 years, is not the authority to complain about who finances the budget of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. Had it not been for the assistance and protection provided by Turkey, there would have been no Turkish Cypriot today in Cyprus.

The attempt to deal with the Cyprus issue on the basis of percentages of population is totally wrong and misleading because the relationship of the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot partners in the body politic of Cyprus was not that of a majority and minority but that of two politically equal national communities, one looking at Turkey and the other at Greece as motherlands, which became the guarantors of the *state of affairs* created by the international Cyprus agreements. The *state of affairs* rested on the principle that neither of the parties had the right to rule the other, nor could either of them assume the right to be the government of both or the island as a whole.

Lastly, I would like to emphasize that the attempt by the Greek Cypriot side to misuse Security Council resolutions which wrongly treat the Greek Cypriot side as the Government of Cyprus at the expense of the rule of law and international agreements is a clear indication that they are not for settling the issue on the basis of a new partnership. The Turkish Cypriot side will work towards a settlement on the basis of two States which would respect the sovereign and equal rights of both peoples and their security interests. We hope that the international community will urge the Greek Cypriot side to adopt a realistic approach that would facilitate such a settlement in Cyprus.

I should be grateful if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 64, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Aytuğ **Plümer**
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

United Nations A/55/1004–S/2001/645

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
28 June 2001

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session
Agenda item 64
Question of Cyprus

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Letter dated 28 June 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 26 June 2001, addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Aytuğ Plümer, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex would be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 64, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Ümit **Pamir**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-43762 (E) 090701

Annex to the letter dated 28 June 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to the statement made by Dr. Christodoulos Christodoulou, Interior Minister of the Greek Cypriot administration, at the special session of the General Assembly for an overall review and appraisal of the implementation of the Habitat Agenda, held in New York from 6 to 8 June 2001, and to bring to your kind attention the following.

At the outset, I would like to draw attention to the fact that the Greek Cypriot official has devoted his entire statement to making false accusations against Turkey and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, which is hardly compatible with the theme and spirit of the said session. He has unabashedly abused the General Assembly special session for propaganda purposes rather than focusing on issues relating to the Habitat Agenda. Since the Turkish Cypriot side is denied the right of reply at the General Assembly, I am compelled to respond to his allegations in writing.

Dr. Christodoulou has claimed that "Cyprus achieved significant socio-economic growth between independence, in 1960, and 1974". This statement is an attempt to cover up the fact that the Cyprus question began, not in 1974, but in 1963, as a result of the destruction, by force of arms, of the partnership Republic of Cyprus by the Greek Cypriot side. This is why a United Nations peacekeeping force (UNFICYP) has been in the island since 1964. It is ridiculous to claim that there was "socio-economic growth" at a time when 30,000 Turkish Cypriot refugees fleeing Greek Cypriot aggression were forced to live in enclaves, all Turkish Cypriots were being persecuted, attacked and harassed on a daily basis and the Turkish Cypriot areas were subjected to inhuman embargoes by the Greek Cypriot administration. The following extracts from the Secretary-General's reports to the Security Council aptly describe the dark period between 1963 and 1974:

> "190. In addition to losses incurred in agriculture and in industry during the first part of the year, the Turkish [Cypriot] community had lost other sources of its income including the salaries of over 4,000 persons who were employed by the Cyprus Government and by public and private concerns located in the Greek Cypriot Zones. The trade of the Turkish [Cypriot] community had declined considerably during the period, owing to the existing situation, and unemployment had reached a very high level, as approximately 25,000 Turkish Cypriots had become refugees. Expenditure of the Turkish Communal Chamber on development and other projects, as well as other expenditure, had dropped considerably as a yearly subsidy formerly received from the Government had ceased to be granted in 1964. ... In accordance with the figures published by the Turkish [Cypriot] Communal Chamber, the number of persons receiving some kind of assistance from the Red Crescent relief amounted to about 56,000, including 25,000 displaced persons, 23,500 unemployed and 7,500 dependents of missing persons, disabled persons and others.
>
> "...
>
> "221. ... Thus in recent weeks, UNFICYP has been devoting major efforts towards eliminating or lessening the hardship experienced by many Turkish

communities in Cyprus because of the economic restrictions which have been imposed by the Government [Greek Cypriot administration] of Cyprus.

"222. ... the economic restrictions being imposed against the Turkish communities in Cyprus, ... in some instances have been so severe as to amount to a veritable siege ..." (S/5950 of 10 September 1964)

The Greek Cypriot Minister has referred to "Turkish invasion" and "occupied areas". I would like to emphasize that the only "occupation" in Cyprus is the 37-year-long occupation of the seat of government of the "Republic of Cyprus" by the Greek Cypriot side. Following the Greek coup d'état in Cyprus in July 1974, Turkey had no choice but to intervene in accordance with its rights and obligations under the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee in order to prevent the annexation of the island by Greece to save the Turkish Cypriot people from total annihilation at the hands of the Greek Cypriots and the invading Greek troops. It will be recalled that the then Greek Cypriot leader, Archbishop Makarios, in his address to the Security Council on 19 July 1974, confirmed that it was in fact Greece, not Turkey, that had invaded the island in 1974.

Dr. Christodoulou also alleged that the question of refugees came about in 1974. The question of refugees, as also documented by the Secretary-General's reports during that period, first began in 1958 when the Greek Cypriot terrorist organization EOKA's gunmen, in their violent campaign to annex the island to Greece, drove 6,000 Turkish Cypriots from their homes in 33 villages; and then in 1963 when the Turkish Cypriot people were subjected to violence and displaced as a result of the Greek Cypriot onslaught. The Turkish Cypriot people who were then forced to evacuate 103 villages had to take refuge in relatively secure enclaves and live under inhuman conditions for 11 years until the Turkish intervention in 1974.

Dr. Christodoulou has referred to "substantial growth achieved since 1974". This pertains to South Cyprus controlled by the Greek Cypriot administration, which purports to be the "Government of Cyprus". Under this usurped title, the Greek Cypriot administration is receiving all international assistance, while preventing the extension of any technical or financial assistance to Northern Cyprus from international sources. Dr. Christodoulou has failed to mention the embargoes his administration has been imposing on the Turkish Cypriot people since 1963, which extends to all spheres of life including trade and tourism, travel and communication as well as sports and cultural activities. These inhuman embargoes not only curtail the economic and social development of the Turkish Cypriot people but also infringe upon their human and civil rights.

While referring to the economic situation, the Greek Cypriot Minister also has had the audacity to claim that the Greek Cypriot administration "is taking into consideration the needs of the whole of Cyprus", while his regime has been imposing the aforementioned embargoes on the Turkish Cypriot people. This is not at all surprising in view of the fact that for the Greek Cypriot side "the needs of the whole of Cyprus" means the needs of only the Greek Cypriots.

Dr. Christodoulou has alluded to the so-called "enforced division" of the island and "severance of the centuries-old settlement system" in an attempt to falsely accuse the Turkish Cypriot side. In this regard, I would like to remind the Greek Cypriot Minister that the division of the island was caused by the Greek Cypriot

attacks on the Turkish Cypriot people, as was also evident in the successive reports of the Secretary-General on Cyprus for the 1964-1974 period.

As for the allegations of "deformation of demographic characteristics of the population of Cyprus", I should like to emphasize that in line with its attempts to change the demographic structure of the island through ethnic cleansing, the Greek Cypriot administration introduced thousands of soldiers and settlers from Greece. I should also like to remind the Greek Cypriot Minister that at the centre of the Greek Cypriot administration's policy was the Akritas Plan, a plan prepared by the Greek Cypriot leadership at the time, to ethnically cleanse Cyprus of its Turkish Cypriot population and to turn Cyprus into a Greek island. In line with this notorious plan, the Greek Cypriot armed elements massacred hundreds of innocent Turkish Cypriots, including three-day-old babies, women and elderly people in an effort to exterminate the Turkish Cypriots or to force them out of Cyprus. Mass graves at Atlilar, Muratağa and Sandallar stand as evidence of the unspeakable crimes committed by the Greek Cypriots against the Turkish Cypriot people.

Even today the inhuman treatment of the few hundred Turkish Cypriots remaining in Southern Cyprus continues. The European Court of Human Rights, on 23 May 2001, found the Greek Cypriot administration guilty of ill-treatment of nine Turkish Cypriots while in detention in Southern Cyprus and ordered the illegal regime to pay compensation to each of the applicants. Furthermore, in April 2001, Dr. Christodoulou himself, in his capacity as the Interior Minister, faced accusations for the mistreatment of around 100 Turkish Cypriot gypsies by the Greek Cypriot authorities in Southern Cyprus. An editorial entitled "Reaction to Gypsies raises uncomfortable questions", published in the *Cyprus Mail* (South Cyprus) dated 10 April 2001, addressed this issue and its implications for the search for a settlement in Cyprus:

> "Is the government's plan to set up a kind of leper colony, miles away from any other community, in which to throw all undesirable visitors such as gypsies and illegal immigrants? This smacks of official racial discrimination and, regrettably, is consistent with the government's policy for dealing with Turkish Cypriots who have arrived from the occupied north. Most have been moved into run-down housing in what used to be known as the Turkish Cypriot quarter of Limassol and can now be described as a Turkish ghetto ...
>
> "The implications of this behaviour should be seriously considered by the political leadership, which has been fighting for the re-unification of the island under a federal government for close to three decades. It may just be that Greek Cypriots do not want the re-unification of the island if this means living next door to a Turkish Cypriot. Would the Greek Cypriot public really be as happy as it claims with a solution that guaranteed the three fundamental freedoms — of movement, settlement and property? Would Paphians be happy if the Turkish Cypriots swarmed to their town or would they be holding protest demonstrations to stop them? What would the residents of Kotsiatis say if Turkish Cypriots decided to return to their homes in the village? ...
>
> "... the xenophobic reaction to the arrival of a few dozen gypsies would seem to suggest that there is a gulf between what the politicians see as the ideal form of a Cyprus settlement and what Greek Cypriots actually want."

Accusations regarding "the systematic change of official toponyms", in Northern Cyprus demonstrate that the Greek Cypriot administration cannot even accept the fact that the Turkish Cypriot people have as much right as the Greek Cypriots to refer to toponyms of their homeland in their own language. The island have always enjoyed dual place names due to the existence of two peoples of different ethnic backgrounds and languages in the island.

As for the allegations regarding historical and cultural heritage, it is important to stress that the authorities of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus work diligently to protect and preserve the cultural heritage of Northern Cyprus regardless of its origin. The Greek Cypriot administration, while accusing the Turkish Cypriot side of attempting to eradicate the heritage of the island, systematically blocks the flow of any external financial or technical assistance to Northern Cyprus for conservation purposes. The Greek Cypriot administration has, since 1963, been trying to eradicate all traces of the Turkish-Muslim heritage of Cyprus. During the period 1963-1974, mosques, shrines and other holy sites in 103 villages were destroyed. Today, the remaining Ottoman Turkish shrines including the historic Bayraktar Mosque and the Ömeriye Mosque located in Southern Cyprus, have been targets of repeated arson attacks and are disintegrating due to total neglect.

Mr. Van der Werff, General Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on the Architectural and Artistic Heritage of the Committee on Culture and Education of the Council of Europe, who visited the island with a delegation of experts to study the situation regarding cultural property both in the North and the South, reported in paragraph 5.3 of his report, which was published as a document of the Council of Europe on 2 July 1989 (AS/CULT/AA(41)1) that "We saw no churches destroyed though St. George in Limnia (in the North) was listed as such."

The report further states that "We noted with regret the complete destruction of the main mosque in Paphos (in the South). The whole area has since been flattened to give way for a widened road junction and a car park. There is no memorial to the existence of the mosque. Below the road a Turkish bath complex remains hidden in rubble and vegetation awaiting restoration. The Turkish cemetery nearby St. Sophia Mouttalos mosque is dilapidated."

More recently, Ms. Vlasta Stepova, a Council of Europe Rapporteur on Cultural Heritage, who visited both sides of the island in November 2000, also confirmed that there is no "vandalism of cultural monuments" in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

On the European Union membership issue, I would like to reiterate that the membership of the Greek Cypriot administration, purporting to act for and on behalf of the whole of Cyprus, on the basis of its unilateral application, is contrary to the 1960 Cyprus Treaties and international law. The Greek Cypriot side's aspiration to become a member of the EU is based on its ultimate objective to use its membership as a pretext to challenge the previously agreed and established parameters within the United Nations process. It is important to note that membership of the Greek Cypriot administration, under the usurped title of "government of Cyprus", would not only destroy all prospects for reconciliation between the two parties, bringing about ultimately the permanent division of the island, but would also pose a threat to peace and stability in the island and in the region.

I should be grateful if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 64, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Aytuğ **Plümer**
Representative
of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

United Nations A/55/1005

General Assembly

Distr.: General
29 June 2001

Original: English

Fifty-fifth session
Agenda item 102
Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries

Letter dated 12 June 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith the text of the declaration adopted by the Ministerial Meeting of the Least Developed Countries held on the eve of the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, which was held in Brussels on 13 May 2001 (see annex).

I would like to request that the present letter and its annex be issued as a document of the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly under agenda item 102.

(*Signed*) Anwarul Karim **Chowdhury**
Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Bangladesh
to the United Nations and Coordinator of the Least Developed Countries

01-43699 (E) 030701

Annex to the letter dated 12 June 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Ministerial Declaration of the Least Developed Countries held on the eve of the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries

Brussels, 13 May 2001

We, the Ministers of the Least Developed Countries, having met on the eve of the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (LDC III) in Brussels on 13 May 2001,

Recalling the Ministerial Declaration of the LDCs adopted on 14 April 2001 in Havana during the South Summit,

Also recalling the Ministerial Declaration of the Least Developed Countries adopted on 18 September 2000 during the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations,

Recalling further the Declaration of the Least Developed Countries adopted during the Third WTO Ministerial Conference in Seattle on 29 November 1999 and the Communiqué by the Ministers of Trade of the Least Developed Countries adopted at UNCTAD X in Bangkok on 13 February 2000,

Welcoming the adoption of the Millennium Declaration by the Heads of State and Government adopted on 8 September 2000 at the Millennium Summit at the United Nations in New York,

Emphasizing the importance of the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries to be held in Brussels from 14 to 20 May 2001,

Declare that:

1. We meet against the backdrop of deteriorating socio-economic conditions and growing marginalization of our countries, while fundamental changes in the global economy resulting from globalization and the rapid advances in science and technology have engendered unprecedented increases in prosperity in the world. It is a matter of grave concern that, despite vigorous political and economic reform efforts, the 49 LDCs, as a group, were neither able to benefit from these global trends and developments nor realize the goals of the Paris Programme of Action for the LDCs for the 1990s. These efforts were retarded mainly by declining ODA flows, limited productive capacity, mounting debt burden, unfavourable market access conditions, inadequate FDI inflows, and severe structural handicaps faced by the LDCs.

2. We stress that, while the primary responsibility for our development rests with us, the amelioration of the worsening socio-economic conditions in the LDCs requires, among other things, substantial and concrete international support measures for these countries, including appropriate poverty eradication programmes and removing the

critical structural impediments to our development. In order to undertake that responsibility, there is need to forge partnership among Governments, international organizations and civil society, including NGOs and the private sector.

3. We attach, in this context, the utmost importance to the Third United Nations Conference on the LDCs, which we view as a great test to the principle of strengthened partnership and shared responsibility to which we have all subscribed under the Programme of Action for the 1990s.

4. We reiterate our full commitment to a successful Conference and undertake to work closely with our development partners with a view to achieving concrete and action-oriented outcomes that can arrest and decisively reverse marginalization, eradicate poverty and thereby improve the present socio-economic conditions in our countries. The success of the Conference will thus be measured by the nature and extent of action-oriented and operational commitments that will have the greatest impact and significantly contribute to the achievement of these objectives.

5. In this spirit, we call for urgent action by our development partners, *inter alia,* in the following specific areas:

- A reversal of the declining trends in ODA flows and early realization of the internationally agreed ODA targets for LDCs no later than 2005, and the improving of aid effectiveness to LDCs through, *inter alia,* untying of aid;

- Resolution of the debt crisis by providing broad, deep and immediate debt relief to all LDCs, including through total debt cancellation;

- Encouragement and promotion of FDI flows, including the provision of incentives for their investors in LDCs;

- Provision of secure and predictable market access through bound, duty-free and quota-free access for all of our products within a specified time-frame, which would enable us to effectively participate in the global economy;

- Operationalization, improvement and full implementation of the measures for special and differential treatment in favour of LDCs, as contained in the WTO Agreements;

- An early agreement, by the fourth WTO Ministerial Conference at the latest, for clear and simplified procedures aimed at facilitating and accelerating the accession of LDCs to WTO and provision of adequate financial and technical assistance to those countries.

6. We express our appreciation to those countries that have fulfilled and exceeded the internationally agreed targets of ODA for LDCs and to those that have improved market access conditions for LDCs' exports, including the Everything But Arms initiative of the European Union, and urge other development partners that have not yet done so to take similar measures for ODA and market access.

7. We attach great importance to the need for an appropriate and effective mechanism for implementation, follow-up, review and monitoring of the Programme of Action for LDCs for the first decade of the new millennium. In this regard, we call upon the Secretary-General of the United Nations to establish an Office of LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS, with adequate financial and human resources, headed by a High Representative immediately after the Conference.

8. We welcome the renewed commitment by some of our development partners in improving the implementation of the Integrated Framework (IF) for Trade-related Technical Assistance for LDCs and the initiatives taken towards this end, in particular through the launching of the IF Pilot Scheme and the establishment of the IF Trust Fund. We invite our development partners to contribute generously to the Trust Fund.

9. We invite and encourage the member countries of the Group of 77 and China to continue their support to our countries in our efforts to integrate beneficially in the global economy and undertake to strengthen this partnership through South-South cooperation.

10. We call upon the United Nations system and all other multilateral organizations as well as other stakeholders to mobilize their efforts in support of the full and effective implementation of the outcome of this Conference with increased coordination, greater synergy and with full commitment.

11. We express our deep appreciation to the European Union for hosting the Conference and the support extended to our countries for the preparations undertaken at the country level. We wish to register our appreciation to all other partners who contributed generously to the success of the preparatory process of the Conference. We also express our appreciation to the Government and people of Belgium for the welcome and hospitality accorded to us. We also extend our appreciation to UNCTAD for its support to the Conference.

United Nations A/55/1006

General Assembly

Distr.: General
2 July 2001
English
Original: Arabic

Fifty-fifth session
Agenda item 40
The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 2 July 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to inform you of the following:

On the afternoon of Sunday, 1 July 2001, Israeli warplanes violated Lebanese airspace and attacked a radar position belonging to the Syrian Arab forces operating in Lebanon in the Duhur al-Ayrun locality of the Bekaa. Two members of the Syrian forces were wounded, as was an enlisted man in the Lebanese Army.

This new attack provides further confirmation of Israel's belligerent character and highlights its violations of Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated as a document of the General Assembly under agenda item 40.

(*Signed*) Sélim **Tadmoury**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-43642 (E) 030701 030701

United Nations A/55/1007–S/2001/653

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
2 July 2001
English
Original: Arabic

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session
Agenda item 40
The situation in the Middle East

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Letter dated 2 July 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to inform you that on Saturday, 30 June 2001, the ministers for foreign affairs of Lebanon and Syria held consultations on the latest Israeli threats and that the two ministries subsequently issued the statement I am transmitting to you herewith (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 40, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Sélim **Tadmoury**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-43621 (E) 050701 050701

Annex to the letter dated 2 July 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Statement issued in Beirut and Damascus on 30 June 2001 following consultations between Mr. Mahmoud Hammoud, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lebanon, and Mr. Farouk Al-Shara', Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic, following the latest Israeli threats

We have noted the statements made by officials in Israel concerning yesterday's act of resistance to the Israeli occupation in the occupied Lebanese Shab'a farmlands and the allegations made in those statements concerning the weapons used by the resistance against the Israeli occupation. We have also noted the Israeli threats against Syria and Lebanon that have been made despite the statement conveyed to Lebanon yesterday by the representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the effect that Israel had undertaken to cease its violations of Lebanon's airspace.

In this connection we should like international public opinion and the Security Council, and in particular its permanent members, to be aware of the following:

1. The defensive weapons that the resistance possesses cannot be compared with the weapons of mass destruction that Israel has and that it constantly uses to threaten Lebanon and Syria. The weapons of the resistance are not comparable with the Israeli warplanes that patrol the skies of Lebanon on a daily basis, that attack its people, its territory and its infrastructure and that are constantly violating Lebanon's international boundaries. The weapons of the resistance also do not compare with the heavy artillery and battle tanks that kill innocent people, destroy homes and set fire to woodlands and forests. These attacks constitute a provocation that must be condemned. They represent aggression against Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and an international community that believes in a just and comprehensive peace must put an end to it.

2. Both before Israel's withdrawal from southern Lebanon in May 2000 and subsequently, Lebanon has affirmed its right under the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant international covenants to liberate its territory using all legitimate means.

3. Lebanon and Syria reject these threats, they will hold Israel responsible for the consequences of any new aggression and for the repercussions it might have in the region as a whole, and they alert the international community to the danger of these threats for the deteriorating situation in the region and for international peace and security.

4. Lebanon and Syria affirm their commitment to international legitimacy, to the Madrid formula, to the necessary implementation of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 425 (1978), and to the principle of land for peace. This is our fixed and established position with a view to achieving the goals for which we strive.

United Nations A/55/1008–S/2001/655

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
3 July 2001

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session
Agenda items 156 and 164

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives

Measures to eliminate international terrorism

Letter dated 29 June 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

A letter dated 6 June 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Armenia to the United Nations has been circulated as a document of the General Assembly and as a document of the Security Council (A/55/984-S/2001/569), in what seems to be a convoluted reply to my letter of 4 May 2001 (A/55/931-S/2001/456) concerning a recent decision taken by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.

To repeat, the said court has sentenced Mourad Topalian, an Armenian activist and former chairman of the Armenian National Committee of America, to 37 months of imprisonment on two counts of terrorism-linked federal crimes, basing its decision on the irrefutable findings of competent United States authorities. Specifically, the explosive material used in the car bombing on 12 October 1980 at the United Nations Plaza wounding five people and causing great damage to several buildings has been linked to the explosive material stored by Topalian. The details supplied in my letter of 4 May left no doubt that this specific court decision had direct relevance to two General Assembly resolutions under the heading "Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives" and "Measures to eliminate international terrorism", i.e. agenda items 156 and 164. Hence the sole intent and purport of my previous letter.

To be precise, my letter did not contain a single reference to the Republic of Armenia. I did register, on the other hand, the official finding of the United States federal authorities that the ultra-nationalist Armenian terrorist group called the "Justice Commandos of the Armenian Genocide" is the military wing of the Dashnak Party in Yerevan, Armenia, and that the above-referred Armenian National Committee of America an affiliate of the same. I should further underline that these connections are not revealed for the first time by the decision of the said district

01-43826 (E) 110701

court but had been already well documented in scholarly studies including the works of Mr. Michael Gunter, who provided ample evidence from the Dashnak press to that effect.

The "venturing in a very unambiguous context inadmissible within the walls of the United Nations," to use the words of the Permanent Representative of Armenia, is a deceitful statement; a bare attempt, in fact, to conceal the real motivation of availing himself of the opportunity to seize a single reference in order to pour out hatred and propagate Armenian falsifications within the walls of the United Nations.

Apparently, even when conveying to the international community important disclosures that have a direct bearing on working agenda items of the General Assembly, a mere reference to the city of Yerevan as the seat of the Dashnak Party is a sufficiently powerful incentive to engage the Permanent Representative of Armenia in linguistic diatribes.

The language employed by the Permanent Representative of Armenia transgresses the basic and time-honoured rules governing civilized conversation between States. Sadly, I no longer expect such compliance from the representative of a country which, anyhow, remained bellicose and irredentist from the very first day of its independence, and which, to this date, occupies one fourth of the territory of its neighbour to the east, Azerbaijan.

Furthermore, the Permanent Representative of Armenia, with remarkable ease of mind, fails to see the essence and thrust of my letter directed towards increased international cooperation to prevent acts of terrorism against diplomatic and consular representatives and missions, as well as international cooperation against terrorism. Instead, the Permanent Representative of Armenia brings forth the accusation that I attempted to link "official Yerevan with certain individual acts of desperation". Let me be very explicit on this point: If I ever feel the need to refer to a link between terrorism and the Armenian Government, I will do exactly that and leave no room for ambiguity.

If Armenia's stance against terrorism is sincere, then it would be worth their while to study the reasons which led the district court to its decision. Trying to label unrepentant terrorism as "individual acts of desperation", on the other hand, is a felony. Only those who are brainwashed enough to believe that ends justify means are capable of regarding a total of more than 230 armed attacks killing 70 innocent people, including 31 Turkish diplomats, and wounding 524 civilians as "individual acts"; and only those, I would like to add, can claim such unabashed defence of evil.

The terrorist acts in question were in fact directed at the same target, namely, Turkish citizens and/or representations, and were coordinated through a maze of complex networks. The car bombing act at the United Nations Plaza, for instance, was carried out on the same day when three other terrorist acts took place in different countries against Turkish representations. While this is the objective reality, the Permanent Representative of Armenia portrays them as "individual acts", and goes on blessing such cold-blooded crimes by pronouncing that these were "aimed at drawing the attention of the world community to the Turkish Government's denial of the fact of the Genocide of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1923". I do not find surprising, after all, that such a perplexed handling of reality ends up by accepting degrees of terrorism where there can be none. This ambiguity towards terrorist methods devalues in a very significant way

the assurances brought forth by the Permanent Representative of Armenia in the latter paragraphs of his letter concerning their stance against terrorism. Remarkably, the letter of the Permanent Representative of Armenia neither refers to nor condemns the terrorist crime perpetrated by Topalian which was the subject matter of my previous letter in the first place.

As a matter of fact, the whole purpose of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Armenia is to reiterate in an aggressive manner the "nationalist Armenian version" of events that took place during the First World War, a blackened era for all the peoples of Anatolia, indeed for humankind.

Finally, the Permanent Representative of Armenia, in yet another twisting of words, intents and places claims that the political wing of the terrorist organization "Grey Wolves", of which Ali Ağça, the terrorist who made an attempt on the life of the Pope in 1981, was a member, makes up part of the current government coalition in Turkey. This is indeed stretching the limits of imagination too far. The political party in question disavowed Ali Ağça two decades ago. The fact is that Ali Ağça is still in prison in Turkey today.

The letter of the Permanent Representative of Armenia contains several allegations along with language that accuses Turkey of "juggling" with historical data. In order to shed light on the actual course of events which were referred to, I deem it necessary to provide the information annexed herewith.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex could be distributed as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 156 and 164, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Umit **Pamir**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

Annex to the letter dated 29 June 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

[Original: English]

It is a fact that after nearly 700 years of peaceful coexistence throughout which the Turkish and Armenian communities enriched each other culturally, socially, economically and otherwise, all the while enjoying exemplary mutual respect — for the want of which we today have to witness ethnic cleansings and carnage in various parts of the world — the two communities saw their relationship fall apart at the turn of the last century at the instigation of the imperialist Powers of the time.

There are hundreds of scholarly works describing the ill-fated designs of the imperialist Powers of the time on the already debilitated Ottoman Empire. I would like to refer to I. V. Bestuzhev's article entitled "Russian Foreign Policy, February-June 1914", which appeared in *1914: The Coming of the First World War*, edited by Walter Laqueur and George Mosse:

> "The move towards a rapprochement with Turkey after the Balkan Wars turned out to be highly unpopular in Russian bourgeois-landlord circles, which were now coming out in favour of a final division of the Ottoman Empire. With this object in view, an entire system of measures was worked out to strengthen Russian influence in Turkey. It contemplated the formation of an autonomous Armenia under Russian protection as the most powerful means of exerting pressure."

Eventually, thousands of armed Armenians did in fact spearhead a massive Russian invasion of eastern Anatolia, faithfully fulfilling the promise given to Tsar Nicholas II by the President of the Armenian national Bureau on 5 November 1914 in Tbilisi: "From all countries Armenians are hurrying to enter the ranks of the glorious Russian army, with their blood to serve the victory of the Russian arms."

The Armenian rebellion began in late 1914. More than 15,000 Anatolian Armenians who went to the Russian South Caucasus for training returned to join the local rebels. Telegraph lines were cut; roads through strategic mountain passes were seized; hundreds of Ottoman officials were attacked, particularly recruiting officers, throughout the east; outlying villages were assaulted. In the service of the Tsarist armies, they seized the city of Van in March 1915 from a weak Ottoman garrison and proceeded to kill 60,000 Turks.

Boghos Nubar, one of the foremost leaders of the Armenians was telling the truth in his letter to *The Times* of London, published on 30 January 1919, begging the allies at the Paris Conference to recognize the "service" of the Armenians:

> "The Armenians have been, since the beginning of the war, de facto belligerents, since they fought alongside the Allies on all fronts, in Palestine and Syria, where the Armenian volunteers recruited by the Armenian National Delegation at the request of the French Government, made up more than half of the French contingent. In the Caucasus, without mentioning the 15,000 Armenians in the Imperial Russian Army, more than 40,000 of their volunteers offered resistance to the Turkish armies."

It is no secret that on the second day of August 1914, the long-running sense of malaise in Europe came to a head and open and secret alliances designed to preserve or to overturn the balance of power in Europe came into operation, starting the massacre of the peoples of Europe. The Ottoman Empire, during the years preceding the outbreak of the First World War, did not take part in the alliance system that wrecked Europe. To be precise, it was the Ottoman Empire itself which was regarded as easy prey within the wider imperialist designs and aspirations of the major Powers. The Empire was not among the six ranking European Powers of the time, and it had been under attack since July 1911.

At the time, nations living within the fold of the multi-ethnic empires, including the Austro-Hungarian Dual Monarchy and the Russian Empire, generally sought to better their lot as nationalism was the fashion of the day. However, the Armenian nationalistic movement was captured by its war-mongering elements ready to start armed rebellion and employ terrorist tactics.

Powers vying for the territories of the Ottoman Empire indeed found a willing collaborator in the ultra-

nationalist Armenian leadership, which, at such a historic juncture, forsook the true and lasting interests of their people, threw all the peoples of eastern Anatolia into imminent danger knowingly risking widespread communal violence in their haste to carve out an independent Armenia.

One should ask to what extent the Armenian leadership of the time bloodied its hands by totally disregarding the dangers inherent in fomenting violence and revolution at a time of war and became responsible for the tragedy that befell the peoples of Anatolia, including those on whose behalf they pretended to speak. Clearly, the actions of the Armenian rebels exacerbated the growing division and mutual fear between the Turks and Armenians of the Ottoman East. After all, outright terror was the chosen weapon of Armenian rebels, and the lands they coveted were overwhelmingly Turkish and Muslim in population.

The Armenian falsifiers today commemorate 24 April 1915 as an august date in the history of their struggle, conveniently forgetting that the Allied fleet had arrived at the head of the Gallipoli peninsula only three days before, on 21 April 1915, presenting a tremendous threat to the country whose citizens, at the ranks of Foreign Minister, ambassadors, and thousands of accomplished people in all walks of life, along with the peasantry, were leading an uncomplicated life until the call for arms and rebellion wrecked stability.

As a matter of fact, the Armenian falsifiers conveniently disregard so many facts essential to a humane, spirited, forward-looking and constructive understanding of the tragic events which took place within the fold of a dying and partly occupied country, that as a result, only hatred and rage, unfortunately, govern their general attitude towards the Turks.

In an article that appeared in the *New York Review of Books* on 8 April 1999, the eminent writer Ian Buruma highlighted some controversial aspects of the focus on identity through victimization in contemporary society. Buruma does not negate the memory of suffering, but he questions "when a culture, ethnic, religious or national community bases its communal identity almost entirely on the sentimental solidarity of remembered victimhood, on the way lies historical myopia and, in extreme circumstances, even vendetta". The problem, as Buruma sees it, is that this "sense of victimization impedes understanding among people; it cannot result in mutual understanding".

It is because of this predicament that the falsifiers would not see that the Armenians who lived in cities where Ottoman control remained intact in western Anatolia were neither deported nor molested; that when the Tsarist armies attacked and occupied eastern Anatolia, more than a million Turks and Muslims had to flee as refugees and were attacked on the roads by Armenian bands; that there was a collapse of authority in eastern Anatolia in the wake of the Tsarist assaults; that killings and massacres were done mutually.

The Armenian falsifiers would rather prefer to claim that if any single Turk was killed during these tragic times, then that was strictly due to self-defence, that no civilian Turks were murdered, raped or pillaged whereas even the Tsarist officers were horrified to see the frenzy of massacring defenceless Turks perpetrated by armed Armenian gangs and paramilitaries in the most vicious manner.

The Armenian falsifiers would reject the description of the above-cited tragic events as civil war and inter-communal violence, because they would like us to ignore the Turkish suffering, and solely focus on Armenian suffering.

As one of the most respected scholars on the history of the Middle East, Professor Bernard Lewis, wrote for *Ha'aretz* on 23 January 1998:

> "The Armenians want to benefit from both worlds. On the one hand, they speak with pride of their struggle against Ottoman despotism, while on the other hand, they compare their tragedy with the Jewish Holocaust."

Even one dead is too many, Turkish or Armenian! But it was a civil war within a world war, where all sides party to the conflict suffered terribly. In the same area, at the same time, and under the same conditions, nearly 3 million Turks and other Muslims perished due to killings, starvation and epidemics.

In bringing forth the question of guilt for this all-encompassing human disaster, fabrications of documents have been taken as truth and authentic documents have been ignored as a result of nationalistic Armenian activism. Unsubstantiated assertions and wartime propaganda have been accepted, whereas the brief of wartime propagandists was simply to make the enemies look as bad as

possible, and make themselves and their friends look as good as could be. This is why the Armenian falsifiers still use the tainted and one-sided documents distributed by the wartime British propaganda machine prepared by the War Propaganda Bureau stationed throughout the war years at Wellington House in London.

Likewise, historians who attempted to find out the truth have been called "genocide deniers". A climate has been created in which historians fear to examine history because of feared personal results. Politicians have decided that they can legislate history, even though they know little or nothing of that history. Slogans have replaced historical judgement.

The Armenian falsifiers are yet to produce a single authentic Ottoman Government dispatch ordering the killing of Armenians. The alleged "genocide of 1.5 million Armenians" should have left countless pieces of evidence that would have saved the Armenian falsifiers from relying upon wartime propaganda, one-sided stories of Christian missionaries who mostly listened to Christian Armenians and not the Muslim Turks, as well as depending solely upon the truly heart-breaking stories of the survivors. It would help them immensely to hear the Turkish side of this argument instead of calling for honouring some of the dead and not all of the dead.

The Permanent Representative of Armenia challenges us that we are "not in a position to disprove with the help of historical data the irrefutable fact of the Genocide". I would take this statement as the normal outcome of their particular world view. If the facts do not fit their theories, the falsifier nationalists would ignore them and look for other ways to make their case. If relying on wartime propaganda and totally ignoring the massacres of the Turks at the hands of the Armenian armed bands proves inadequate at the end of the day to convince those who rightfully demand robust historical data, evidence and analysis, then the falsifiers would say, as is the case for the Permanent Representative of Armenia, that "Ankara attempts to revive the medieval practice of blaming for the violence the very victims of the violence, in the hope that the endless repetition of the lie will make it true". After all, in the pursuit of radical nationalist agendas, there are no limits set for committing intellectual crimes.

Turkey has never blamed thousands of innocent Armenian individuals, women and children who perished in that era for finding themselves unaided and at peril because of a radical politics in which they did not make part. But we do blame the so-called nationalist revolutionaries who have fomented war, sided by invading enemy armies, killed innocent people because of their race and religion, thus beginning the action in the full knowledge that they were thereby achieving their objective of creating two warring sides. The majority of the Armenians had no wish for war, but they had been driven into it by their senseless, revolutionary, radical and nationalist leadership acting hand in hand with armed bands.

We do blame those who refuse to this day to see the Turkish suffering; propagate that the Turks were and are evil personified; fail to take honourably their part of the onus; refuse even to glance at documents which do not fit their world view, and which do not promote their own political ends.

I can further, in the words of the Permanent Representative of Armenia, "deliberately falsify and juggle with historical and political realities:"

The British were the closest party to these events, because they were the principal occupying Power of the Ottoman Empire and its capital, Istanbul. They had full control of the Ottoman Archives. As such, the British led an in-depth investigation against 144 highly placed Ottoman officials including Ministers, who were charged with war crimes against the Armenians. Subsequently, 56 out of the 144 accused were deported to the island of Malta to stand trial. After a wide-scale and frantic search of all the archival material, Sir Horace Rumbold, the British High Commissioner in Istanbul, wrote to London that the "evidence against the deportees are [sic] very few. Under these circumstances, the prosecution finds itself under grave disadvantage". But he added that "he hoped that the American Government could supply a large amount of documentary information". (FO/371/6500/E.3557)

In failing to find any legally acceptable evidence against the deportees, Lord Curzon, the British Foreign Secretary at the time, informed Geddes, the British Ambassador at Washington, that there was "considerable difficulty" in establishing proof of guilt against the Turkish detainees at Malta, and requested him "to ascertain if the United States Government is in

possession of any evidence that could be of value for the purpose of prosecution". (FO/371/6502/E.5845)

On 13 July 1921, the British Embassy at Washington gave the following reply:

> "I regret to inform Your Lordship that there was nothing therein which could be used as evidence against the Turks who are being detained for trial at Malta. Having regard to this stipulation and the fact that the reports in the possession of the Department of State do not appear in any case to contain evidence against these Turks which would be useful for the purposes of corroborating information already in possession of His Majesty's Government, I fear that nothing is to be hoped from addressing any further inquiries to the United States Government in this matter". (FO/371/6504/E.8519)

Subsequently, all charges against the Ottoman detainees were dismissed.

More recently, on 14 April 1999, Foreign Office spokesperson Baroness Ramsay of Cartvale said the following:

> "The British Government had condemned the massacres at the time. But in the absence of unequivocal evidence that the Ottoman Administration took a specific decision to eliminate the Armenians under their control at that time, British Governments have not recognized those events as indications of genocide. Nor do we believe it is the business of Governments of today to review events of over 80 years ago, with a view to pronouncing on them."

Furthermore, acting on behalf of the British Government, Baroness Scotland of Asthal said the following in a written response on 7 February 2001:

> "The Government, in line with previous British Governments, have judged the evidence not to be sufficiently unequivocal to persuade us that these events should be categorized as genocide as defined by the 1948 United Nations Convention on Genocide, a Convention which was drafted in response to the Holocaust and is not retrospective in application. The interpretation of events in eastern Anatolia in 1915-1916 is still the subject of genuine debate among historians."

So much for "the process of achieving international recognition of the Genocide of Armenians which has appreciably gained momentum" according to the Permanent Representative of Armenia. One should ask why a handful of 30-plus deputies out of nearly 600 parliamentarians were present when the French Parliament voted on the so-called Genocide Resolution. The Permanent Representative of Armenia should keep in mind the future when the realities of a terrible war in which millions on all sides died will no longer be ignored, and when a very different picture will emerge as politics are avoided and the standard procedures of historical analysis are applied to this question. It will be seen then that there is a vast difference between history written to defend one-sided nationalist convictions and what true historical analysis should be.

Indeed, in presenting the Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Genocide for ratification, the Secretary-General of the United Nations emphasized that genocide is a crime of "specific intent", requiring conclusive proof.

I hope that the above information contributes to the correct perception of the First World War era events in eastern Anatolia.

United Nations A/55/1009

General Assembly

Distr.: General
3 July 2001
English
Original: Chinese and English

Fifty-fifth session
Agenda item 179
Review of the problem of human immunodeficiency virus/ acquired immunodeficiency syndrome in all its aspects

Letter dated 2 July 2001 from the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

During the general debate of the just-concluded twenty-sixth special session of the General Assembly on HIV/AIDS, delegates from a very few countries raised the so-called issue of "Taiwan's participation in the United Nations and the World Health Organization". In this regard, and upon instruction from my Government, I hereby state our position as follows:

The one-China principle has already been widely recognized by the international community. The great majority of the States Members of the United Nations have diplomatic relations with China and they have all acknowledged that there is only one China in the world, that the Government of the People's Republic of China is the sole legal Government representing the whole of China and that Taiwan is an inseparable part of China. In 1971, at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, the Assembly adopted resolution 2758 (XXVI), which has solved once and for all, in political, legal and procedural terms, the issue of China's representation in the United Nations. The Government of the People's Republic of China rightfully represents all Chinese, including our compatriots in Taiwan, in the United Nations system and all its specialized agencies, including the World Health Organization. Therefore, there is simply no such issue as the so-called "Taiwan's participation in the United Nations and the World Health Organization".

The United Nations and the World Health Organization are intergovernmental international organizations composed of sovereign States. As a part of China, Taiwan is not eligible to participate, in whatever name and under whatever pretext, in the work or activities of the United Nations and the World Health Organization. However, that a very few countries, instigated by the Taiwan authorities, raised such a political issue on the platform of the special session of the General Assembly on HIV/AIDS, whose focus is and should only be on the discussion on combating HIV/AIDS, is absolutely inappropriate. Such an act is an attempt to create in the United Nations a situation of "two Chinas" or "one China, one Taiwan" and a violation of the purpose and principles of the Charter of the United Nations as well

01-43812 (E) 030701

as of resolution 2758 (XXVI). It is a gross interference in China's internal affairs. The Chinese Government condemns this.

I have the honour to request that the present letter be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 179.

(*Signed*) **Wang** Yingfan
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of the Permanent Mission
of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations